WO 1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 7 8 Rex Whitehead, Plaintiff, 9 CIV 04-867 PHX VAM 10 v. Rockford Corporation, 11 ORDER 12 Defendant. On November 2, 2005, the undersigned ordered plaintiff to 13 14 show cause by November 14, 2005 why this case should not be dismissed for failure to serve the Amended Complaint and follow 15 16 court orders. Plaintiff did not respond to the order to show 17 cause. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) states: 18 19 (m) Time Limit for Service. If service of the summons and complaint is not made upon a defendant within 120 days after the filing of the complaint, the court, upon 20 motion or on its own initiative after notice to the plaintiff, shall dismiss the action without prejudice as 21 to that defendant or direct that service be effected within a specified time; provided that if the plaintiff 2.2 shows good cause for the failure, the court shall extend 23 the time for service for an appropriate period. . . 24 Rule 4(m), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. 25 The complaint in this action was filed on April 27, 2004 (Doc. 1) and an amended complaint was filed on July 12, 2005 (Doc. 26 Pursuant to an Order dated July 11, 2005, plaintiff was 27 13).

given until September 30, 2005 to properly serve the amended

28

Case 2:04-cv-00867-VAM Document 15 Filed 11/21/05 Page 2 of 2

1	complaint or risk dismissal of the action. As stated above,
2	plaintiff has failed to serve the amended complaint has failed to
3	respond to the Court order to show cause.
4	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is dismissed without
5	prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).
6	DATED this 21st day of November, 2005.
7	
8	Virginia A. Mathis
9	United States Magistrate Judge
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	2